

REMARKS

Claims 30-53 were pending when last examined. With this Response, Applicants have cancelled claims 50-53, amended claims 30, 32-34, 36-38, 40-42, 44-46, 48 and 49, and added new claims 54-57. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment can be found at least in FIGS. 2-7 and the corresponding description in the specification.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, 46, and 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,469,711 to Foreman et al. (“Foreman”). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claim 30, as amended, recites generating segment group information defining a segment group that includes a plurality of segments selected from a multimedia stream. The segment group information includes segment order information defining that two or more segments within the segment group are unordered.

Foreman discloses a graphical user interface for video editing. *Abstract*. The user interface uses a story board that represents a written description of a video program, and includes a time ordered list of video shots. *FIG. 5 and col. 5:11-49*. Foreman’s story board, however, always assigns a respective number to each video shot to define their sequential order. Thus, Foreman fails to disclose segment order information defining that segments within a segment group are unordered. Because Foreman fails to disclose at least the claimed segment order information, claim 30 is allowable.

Independent claims 34, 38, 42, and 46, recite segment order information that is similar to that recited in claim 30. Because Foreman fails to disclose at least this limitation, independent claims 34, 38, 42 and 46 are allowable.

Dependent claims 33, 37, 41, 45, and 49 are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective base claim.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 44, 47, and 48 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foreman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,278,446 to Liou et al. (“Liou”). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 44, 47, and 48 are dependent claims, whose respective base claim recites segment order information defining that two or more segments within the segment group are unordered. As discussed above, Foreman fails to disclose this limitation. Liou is equally lacking.

Liou discloses a system for interactively organizing and browsing video streams. *Abstract*. Although Liou discloses grouping video shots into a tree structure, Liou’s tree structure preserves the time order among shots. *Col. 5:31-34*. Thus similar to Foreman, Liou also fails to disclose segment order information defining that two or more segments within a segment group are unordered.

Because neither Foreman nor Liou discloses the claimed segment order information, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, and claims 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 44, 47, and 48 are allowable.

New Claims

Applicants have added new claims 54-57. The new claims depend from claim 30, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 30.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the pending claims be allowed and the case passed to issue. Should the Examiner wish to discuss the Application, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned at (415) 772-7493.

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL NO.:

EV 611 224 907 US

Respectfully submitted,

By:



Ferenc Pazmandi
Agent of Record
Limited Recognition No. L0078
FP/rp

October 20, 2005

SIDLEY AUSTIN BROWN & WOOD LLP
555 California Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94104-1715
(415) 772-7200